SOME NEW BOOKS.

Lord Derby.

It is the so-called Rupert of debate, the late, and not the present, Earl of Derby, who is the subject of the latest contribution to the series of political biographies entitled the *Queen's Prime Ministers*. (Harpers'.) The author, Mr. GEORGE SAINTSBURY, does not profess to be impartial, but, on the contrary, avows himself a Tory; indeed, in his eyes, Lord Derby's Toryism seems tardy, lukewarm, and inconsistent. He has given us, nevertheless, a satisfactory estimate of an interesting person, not the less satisfactory because there can be no mistake about the author's viewpoint. But while Mr. Saintsbury regrets that Toryism of the kind prevalent before the passage of the first Reform act is now defunct, he recognizes that only with the weapons of the present Conservative-Democratic party can the radicalism of our day be opposed with any hope of success. That those weapons were fashioned by Mr. Disraeli and Lord Derby is beyond dispute, and it is probable that but for the social and political influence commanded by the latter, Mr. Disraeli would never have obtained a favorable field for the exhibition of his talents, and the Conservative party, as we now see it, would never have existed. The key to what seems most striking in Lord Derby's subsequent career, and to the nature of the influence which he exerted over Conservatives, is to be found in the fact that he entered Parliament as a Whig, that he held the offices of Chief Secretary for Ireland and of Colonial Secretary in Earl Grey's administration, and that he vigorously supported such distinctively Whig measures as the first Reform bill and the bill for the abolition of slavery in the West Indies.

I.

Edward Geoffrey Stanley, the grandson of the twelfth Earl of Derby, was born at Knowsley on March 29, 1799. His grandmother was a Hamilton, and his mother was Charlotte Margaret Hornby. Both the thirteenth Earl and his son, the subject of this biography, were called to the House of Peers in the lifetime of their respective fathers as Lords Stanley of Bickerstaffe. The old second title of the family, Lord Strange, has never been revived in recent times, and the second son of our Lord Derby now holds the new title of Lord Stanley of Preston. Edward Geoffrey went in due course to Eton, and thence to Christ Church.

Except at Oriel, the Oxford of the end of the Regency was not a specially stimulating place. It was both then and afterward rather the fashion at Christ Church not to take a degree, and that young Stanley left the university without taking one is nothing extraordinary. That he took the Chancellor's prize for Latin verse in 1819, with a poem on Syracuse, indicates that as the school was then arranged he might have taken honors had he so chosen. In 1820, almost as soon as he was legally qualified, Mr. Stanley was returned to Parliament, not for a family borough, but for the very corrupt one of Stockbridge. It belonged to a Tory West Indian, who happened to want money, and he sold it to a Whig peer who nominated Stanley. Lord Derby himself, not long afterward, complained of the rotten borough members that, whatever might be their talents they were not looked upon by the people as their representatives. Mr. Saintsbury, who, as we have said, is an unflinching, old-fashioned Tory, believes that a thoroughgoing political thinker would have asked whether if you get the best men to govern the country you do not thereby infallibly get the best system of representation? We have few personal details of Lord Derby at this time. We know, however, that he used to go about in the old Whig uniform of buff and blue; that in 1824 he made a tour in North America, which was as unusual then as it would be unnoteworthy now, and that he performed his second most important duty as punctually as he had done the first—that of getting into Parliament—by marrying in 1825 Emma Caroline Wilbraham, a daughter of the family which had succeeded the Stanleys in the Lincolnshire country seat of Lathom. In the next year he was returned for Preston, which was in one sense a family borough, but by no means one merely in the family nomination. At this election he stood at the head of the poll and William Cobbett at the bottom. He was already known as a sportsman as well as a politician, his grandfather who had started the Oaks twenty years before he was born having initiated him in both mysteries.

We have mentioned the principal incidents in that part of Lord Derby's career during which he was connected with the Whig party. He resigned from Lord Grey's Government in May, 1834, on the acceptance of a motion declaring the necessity of reducing and redistributing the Irish Church revenue. The church point was perhaps the only one on which Stanley never paltered, hesitated, or changed his mind during his entire political life. Commenting on his desertion of the Whigs, Greville says that his grandfather, the twelfth Earl of Derby, never would hear of his grandson's superlative merits, and always in the midst of his triumphs questioned his ultimate success. Nevertheless, the grandson lived to become thrice Prime Minister. For a time after leaving the Whig Government Stanley remained a free lance, refusing to join the first administration of Sir Robert Peel, but he did join the second, returning to his old post in the Colonial Office. Three years later he was called up to the House of Lords by the title of Lord Stanley of Bickerstaffe. On Peel's proposing the repeal of the corn laws Lord Stanley resigned, and opposed the bill when it came up in the Lords in a speech which Palmerston and others thought his very finest. It should be noted that when Peel resigned after the first proposal of the measure, Stanley had been invited to form a Government, but refused. It seems to be entirely unknown when he was first thrown into close relations with Disraeli, whom at the time of Peel's conversion to free trade he had not apparently even known. It is, perhaps, significant of Disraeli's real feeling toward the man whom he was compelled by circumstances to accept as a leader, that the reader of Disraeli's Life of Lord George Bentinck would hardly suppose Lord Stanley to have played a remarkable part in politics at all. In 1851, on the resignation of Lord John Russell, Lord Stanley was a second time invited to form a Government and again refused, not, however, without making real efforts to profit by the opportunity. The efforts were fruitless, owing to the unwillingness of the Peelites to coöperate with the Protectionist party proper. The Protectionists themselves were at this epoch deplorably weak in men of ministerial calibre. It was in April of this year that Greville had his famous meeting with Lord Stanley at Newmarket, and was shocked at finding him in the midst of a crowd in the ring, playing wagers that he would not sneeze, however much snuff he took. In June following his father died, and he became what he is to history, Lord Derby. In February, 1852, Lord John Russell, having been beaten in the House of Commons, resigned, and Lord Derby was once more sent for. This time he did not hesitate, but formed a government out of such material as he could find, and brought to an end the period of the Tory party's exclusion from office. The Tories, however, now had to undergo the trial of accession to responsibility with untested proofs and leaders and with a programme as yet almost entirely unformed. They never fully emerged from this further period of trial during Lord Derby's lifetime, but without him they would probably have remained in the wilderness almost indefinitely. Nothing but his commanding position in certain respects could have covered the deficiencies of Disraeli in the same respect, though it is admitted by Mr. Saintsbury that nothing but Disraeli's talents could have prevented Lord Derby himself from meeting the fate of Melbourne. According to Lord Malmesbury, Lord Derby at this time treated Disraeli coldly, so much so that Malmesbury began to protest on the serious consequences that a mutual dislike between the two leaders might produce, and could only trust in Disraeli's "good temper and ambition" to prevent it. The thrust turned out to be well founded.

It used to be the custom to speak of the Derby Ministry of 1852 as a sort of Cabinet *pour rire*. This is due mainly to the fact that throughout the third quarter of this century the Peelite and Liberal party had the higher newspaper press almost to themselves, and could count a considerable majority among the writers of books. In Mr. Saintsbury's opinion, the worst that could be said of this Government is that it was inexperienced. He did not have time to remedy this defect, being able to retain office only a year. In 1855 Lord Derby was again invited to form a Ministry, but refused, to the disgust of Mr. Disraeli.

Mr. Saintsbury considers this the great mistake of Lord Derby's life. He was supported by nearly half of the House of Commons, the Whig-Peelite coalition was utterly discredited, the Radicals were not as yet to be reckoned with as a real force in the country, and he had only to take up and carry on the Crimean war, which was thoroughly approved by the vast majority of Englishmen. When he did accept for a second time the office of Prime Minister, in February, 1858, he took it with a much smaller following in both Houses, especially in that which has and had the prerogative vote. Lord Derby's second Ministry was a Government on sufferance, and, of course, could not last long. It was during his second tenure of office that the Jews were admitted to Parliament, that Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton was made Colonial Secretary, and that Mr. Gladstone was made a High Commissioner in the Ionian Islands. According to the present biographer, Lord Derby was always on very good terms with Mr. Gladstone. In regard to no one had the Tory Premier's tendency to reunite himself with the Peelites been more frequently shown, and it is probable that he hoped that this appointment of Mr. Gladstone might pave the way to a reunion. As a Tory, Mr. Saintsbury naturally considers the results of Mr. Gladstone's mission disastrous, inasmuch as to it may be traced the subsequent cession of the Ionian Isles to Greece. To Lord Derby himself the most interesting, and also the most disappointing event of the year 1858, seems to have been this namesake race in which his horse, Thophilite, which had been made favorite, ran second to Beadsman.

It is well known that Lord Derby during his second Ministry brought in a Conservative Reform bill, and having been beaten by the Liberals dissolved Parliament. At the ensuing general election he did not succeed in obtaining a majority, and a vote of want of confidence having been passed on June 5, 1859, he was compelled to resign. Mr. Saintsbury thinks that Lord Derby's second government was killed by his own sins, that is to say, through its meddling with the franchise, a thing which in his opinion should have been left to the Liberals. Of course the same criticism is repeated at a later stage of Lord Derby's career. During the next seven years, or at least up to the death of Lord Palmerston, Lord Derby showed no desire to secure the return of his party to power. Indeed, it was believed that there existed a compact, written or unwritten, between him and Lord Palmerston, whereby the latter could depend upon Tory support against Radical attack. After Lord Palmerston's death, however, the influence of the Radicals compelled the Liberal Government to bring in a Reform bill, which was beaten in April, 1866, through a cave organized by Mr. Lowe. Then for the third and last time Lord Derby returned to power and managed to form a strong Ministry of Tory materials alone. The new blood included Mr. Gathorne Hardy and Lord Cranborne (now Lord Salisbury), Lord Carnarvon, and Sir Stafford Northcote. Lord Derby's son, Lord Stanley, the present Earl, received the Foreign Office. Two of these Ministers, Lord Cranborne and Lord Carnarvon, together with Gen. Peel, left the Cabinet in February, 1867, because they could not agree to the scheme adopting household suffrage which figured in the Derby-Disraeli Reform bill commonly described by Tories as "a leap in the dark." In February, 1868, occurred Lord Derby's third and final resignation of office, not this time because his enemies drove him out of it, but because his health was unequal to the task it imposed. It had not been quite certain in the party whether his son or Mr. Disraeli would succeed him, but the Queen's choice fell on the latter. The Tory Ministry maintained itself for a long time, but it was no longer Lord Derby's Government. His forty years of active participation, subordinate or supreme, in office or in opposition, during which he had entirely reconstructed one of the two great parties and had been thrice Prime Minister of England, were over before the arrangements necessitated by the enormous change in the franchise which he had brought about were complete. As to his exact attitude toward that change, Mr. Saintsbury credits him with a genuine wish to get the question of reform done with and out of the way, and also with a little of the "after me the deluge" feeling. It was hard for him, who had been a vigorous advocate of the first Reform act, to believe that mischievous consequences would inevitably follow the extension of the suffrage. Although no one had more of the Tory spirit in some ways than Lord Derby, he was not a Tory born nor a Tory bred, and he had not merely no coherent Tory theory of politics; but no coherent theory of politics at all.

II.

It is natural that a man of Mr. Saintsbury's tastes and accomplishments should devote considerable space to Lord Derby's literary work. The Tory leader ceased to keep racehorses in 1863 and thenceforth gave much of his leisure to literary compositions. Part of his work in this direction has been collected in two volumes, containing his translation of the Iliad and several minor versions from a considerable number of languages. The range of his reading was rather wider than was usual, even with cultivated men of his stamp, for his translations include subjects from French, German, and Italian, and bear witness to both knowledge and insight. It is pointed out that in our day scholarship seems tending to be divorced from literary appreciation, but in Lord Derby's case they went hand in hand. Mr. Saintsbury thinks that Lord Derby got as near as any one to a reproduction of the true Horatian manner. The translation of the well known ode, "*Eheu fugaces*," is particularly commended. The translation of the Iliad was first published as a whole in 1864, though, according to Lord Malmesbury, the author was at work on it as early as 1853. It had a remarkable popular success, going through five editions in seven months. On the other hand, it has not been favorably treated by Homeric scholars, though Mr. Saintsbury seems to think their appreciation unjust. He admits that Lord Derby's style has very little ornament and that such ornament as he has is of a kind now unfashionable. He draws near to, if he does not actually reproduce, the worst features of the poetic diction of the last century, the artificial lingo which reigned supreme in the interval between Dryden and Erasmus Darwin. Lord Derby's version, being written in blank verse and in somewhat conventionalized literary English, comes closest in general characteristics and circumstances to Cowper's.

Some of the personal characteristics of Lord Derby are summed up in a concluding chapter. In the history of few statesmen does temperament play so large a part. There must have been something in the constant complaints of his not taking things seriously, of his acting on impulse, of his flings and outbreaks, of his figuring one hour in the dignified precincts of St. Steven and at the next among the blackguards of Newmarket. Mr. Saintsbury, however, is inclined to think that it would be more fair to say, not that Lord Derby did not take politics seriously enough, but that he took everything with equal seriousness—politics, sport, the delight of battle, the charms of indolence, the sense of political leadership, the sense of its irksomeness. There is scarcely any other English statesman of whom so many witty sayings are recorded. The Greville story is that on the first Council day, after Lord Derby's elevation to the Premiership, Greville showed his disapproval by not appearing in his place as clerk. Some busybody asked Lord Derby whether he had noticed Greville's absence, and Lord Derby replied with a face of benevolent aplogy: "No, really? You know, I am the most inattentive fellow in the world about these things. I *never* notice when I ring the bell whether John or Thomas answers it." More generally known is the anecdote told by Lord Derby in the House of Lords for the benefit of a youthful peer of great promise who had a habit of nagging at the Tory leader—the anecdote of the Lancashire collier, whose wife used to beat him, and who, being remonstrated with for allowing the practice, pleaded as an excuse for his forbearance that it amused her and didn't hurt him. According to another story, when Lord Derby had made a furious attack on some of his rivals, a friend came up to him as he sat down amid shouts of applause and said, "You know that that was horribly unfair?" "Yes," replied Lord Derby, "but didn't you see how effective it was?" It was a rather Rabelaisian retort which he made to a certain lady who rallied him upon the composition of his first Ministry. Lady —— asked in regard to a respectable and hardworking politician, who was afterward transferred from the head of the baronets to the tail of the peers, "Is so-and-so a real man?" "I don't know," said Lord Derby: "at any rate he has had three wives." It is acknowledged by Mr. Saintsbury that Lord Derby's jests were sometimes rather trying to the objects of them, but he finds it less intelligible that they should have scandalized the public, as they seem to have done. He undoubtedly reserved his superciliousness for those who were either actually his own equals or moved in the same society with himself. An aristocrat, as he was accused of being, he was more liked by his inferiors in station than most democrats. Although Lancashire was not then the home of Toryism, which it has since become, Lord Derby did much to make it so, and was extraordinarily popular with his neighbors and tenants. He was indeed a delightfully human person; as human as Lord Palmerston, with far more scholarship and a higher eloquence; as good a scholar, indeed, as Mr. Gladstone, with more humor and more humanity; as sharp with his tongue as Disraeli himself, with the advantage of better breeding and a more English tone; a thorough sportsman, the absence of which quality is urged by some Tories as the only spot in Lord Salisbury's sun; of far heavier calibre than Lord Melbourne, who rivalled Derby and Palmerston in the easy wearing of honors; and, finally, a man of original genius, which distinguished him from the Aberdeens and Greys. He was absolutely free from the priggishness which marred the high spirit, true patriotism, and unflagging industry of Lord John Russell. By dint, moreover, of that very lack of seriousness with which he has been reproached, he escaped the charge of being too much of the counting-house order of Ministers—a charge levelled at Sir Robert Peel. In a word, Lord Derby is pronounced the most perfect example ever seen in England of the aristocratic type of Ministers of a constitutionally governed country. He could be nobly serious when the occasion required seriousness, and he was quite free from the excessive pococurantism which Lord Palmerston affected. But he could always see the humor of life, and this rescued him from gush and cant, the two besetting vices of the politician. It protected him almost entirely from the risk of being worn out by nervous exhaustion, and it shielded him from the approaches of sycophants. If his sense of humor carried with it the danger of seeing things too small, it freed him from the greater danger of seeing them too large. This quality, combined as it was with high and generous sentiment, with wide and active intelligence, with a thorough knowledge of literature and an ardent affection for his country, provided a type of statesman not fit for all emergencies or free from all reproach, but of singular interest and charm.

M. W. H.

Romanes on Darwin.

The Open Court Publishing Company of Chicago have brought out the second of three volumes about Darwinism by Mr. GEORGE JOHN ROMANES, who, next to Mr. A. R. Wallace, is perhaps the most distinguished English student of the questions with which Darwin's name is preëminently associated. The first volume of the series, whose publication is postponed for a considerable time, will deal with the history of biology from the earliest recorded times till the appearance of the "Origin of Species" in 1859. The third volume, which may be expected in the autumn, will discuss the further developments of the Darwinian hypothesis since Mr. Darwin's death, which occurred in 1882. The volume before us presents an exposition of the Darwinian theory and considers the various criticisms which were advanced from time to time during the author's lifetime upon his fundamental principles of natural selection and sexual selection. The value of this book lies chiefly in the fact that it is intended not for professed naturalists but for general readers, and that consequently the author is everywhere careful to avoid assuming even the most elementary knowledge of natural science on the part of those to whom the present treatise is addressed. In this respect the volume before us must differ from its successors, in which, as treating with the important questions touching heredity, utility, isolation, &c., which have been raised since Darwin's death, the possession of some technical knowledge will have to be taken for granted. It would be difficult, for instance, for the reader unacquainted with the rudiments of natural science to understand the views of Prof. Weismann unless they were translated into ordinary untechnical language.

Before adverting to the criticisms of Darwin's main positions and to the arguments by which the author meets them, we may answer the not unreasonable question, why in the presence of the mass of Darwinian literature a new exposition of Darwin's teaching is required? The truth is that nowadays there are many naturalists who, without having paid any close attention to the subject, deem themselves entitled to express authoritative opinions with regard to Darwinism. These men may have done admirable work in other departments of natural history, and yet their opinions on the specific researches and conclusions of Darwin may be destitute of value. As there is no necessary relation between erudition in one department of science and soundness of judgment in another, the mere fact that a man is distinguished as a botanist or zoölogist does not in itself qualify him to criticise where specially Darwinian questions are concerned. It happens now, as it happened thirty years ago, that highly distinguished botanists and zoölogists prove themselves incapable as judges of general reasoning. It was Darwin's complaint that for many years nearly all his scientific critics either could not, or would not, understand what he had written, and this even as regarded the fundamental principles of his theory, which, with the utmost clearness, he had over and over again repeated. The only difference between such naturalists and their successors of the present day is that the latter have grown up in a Darwinian environment and so have more or less thoughtlessly adopted some form of Darwinian creed. But this scientific creed is not a whit less dogmatic and intolerant than was the more theological one which it has supplanted, and while it usually incorporates the main elements of Darwin's teaching, it still more usually comprises gross perversions of their consequences. All this Mr. Romanes has occasion to show at length in the present work.

It is to be added that this book carefully preserves the distinction between the fact of evolution and the manner of it, or between the evidence of evolution as having taken place somehow and the evidence of the causes which have been concerned in the process. This most important distinction is frequently disregarded by popular writers on Darwinism, and therefore it is not until the author has fully considered the proof of organic evolution as a process which somehow or other *has* taken place, that he proceeds to consider *how* it has taken place. Referring the reader to the book itself for the exposition of both kinds of affirmative evidence, we pass at once to the criticisms of Darwin's position and to the author's defence of it.

I.

One of the first assailants of the Darwinian theory was Owen, who objected that the struggle for existence could only act as a cause of the extinction of species, not of their origination. Mr. Romanes submits that this view of the case shows on his part a complete failure to grasp the conception of Darwinism. Acting alone, the struggle for existence could only cause extermination; but acting together with variation, survival, and heredity, it may very well, for anything that Owen has shown to the contrary, have produced every species of plant and animal that has ever appeared upon the face of the earth. Another and closely allied objection is that the theory of natural selection "personifies an abstraction," or, as the Duke of Argyll states it, the theory is "essentially the image of mechanical necessity concealed under the clothes and parading in the mask of mental purpose. The word 'natural' suggests matter and the physical forces; the word 'selection' suggests mind and the powers of choice." It is pointed out that this is a mere quibbling about words. Darwin called the principle which he had discovered by the name natural selection, in order to mark the analogy between it and artificial selection. In this analogy there was not necessarily supposed to be in nature any counterpart to the mind of the reader, nor, therefore, to his powers of intelligent choice. There is, however, no need to limit the term "selection" to powers of intelligent choice. A bank of seaweed on the seashore may be said to have been selected by the waves from all the surrounding sand and stones. So, too, it may be said that grain is selected from chaff by the wind in the process of winnowing corn. Or, if it be thought that any ambiguity is involved in such a use of the word in "natural selection," there is no objection to employing the phrase coined by Herbert Spencer as its equivalent, namely, "survival of the fittest." The point of Darwin's theory is that those organisms which are best suited to their surroundings are allowed to live and to propagate, while those which are less suited are eliminated; and whether we call this process a process of selection, or give it any other name, is clearly immaterial.

A more material question is raised when it is asked whether the process is one that can be ascribed to causation strictly natural. It is often denied that such is the case on the ground that natural selection does not originate the variations which it favors, but depends upon the variations being supplied by some other means. All that natural selection does is to preserve the suitable variations after they have arisen. Natural selection does not *cause* these suitable variations; and, therefore, it is argued that Darwin and his followers are mistaken in representing the principle as one which produces adaptations. This objection, also, seems to Mr. Romanes to betoken an extraordinary failure to appreciate the very essence of Darwinian doctrine. It is, of course, admitted that natural selection does not produce variations of any kind, whether beneficial or otherwise. But if it be granted that variations of many kinds are occurring in every generation, and that natural selection is competent to preserve the more favorable among them, then it is pronounced unquestionable that this principle of selection deserves to be regarded as in the full sense of the word—a natural cause. The variations being expressly looked upon by the theory as more or less promiscuous, survival of the fittest becomes the winnowing fan whose function it is to eliminate all the chaff in each generation in order to preserve the good grain out of which to constitute the next generation. As this process, moreover, is supposed to be continuous through successive generations, its action is supposed to be cumulative till from the eye of a worm there is gradually developed the eye of an eagle. It follows from these suppositions that if it had not been for the process of selection such development would never have been begun; and that in the exact measure of its efficiency will the development proceed. But any agency without the operation of which a result cannot take place, may properly be designated the cause of that result. It is the agency which, in coöperation with all the other agencies in the cosmos, produces that result. When Darwin calls the multitudinous variations of plants and animals "accidental," he expressly says that he does not suppose them to be accidental in the sense of not all being due to definite causes. But they are accidental in relation to the sifting process of natural selection; all that they have to do is to furnish the promiscuous material on which the sifting process acts. Darwin's critics have misunderstood this term "accidental," which he used in its original and philosophically correct sense.

There is another very prevalent misunderstanding of the Darwinian theory. Why, it is asked, if some species are supposed to have been improved by natural selection, have not all species been similarly improved? Why should not all invertebrated animals have risen into vertebrated? Why should not all monkeys have become men? In the first place, answers Mr. Romanes, it by no means follows that because an advance in organization has proved itself of benefit in the case of one form of life, therefore any or every other form would have been similarly benefitted by a similar advance. The business of natural selection is to bring this and that form of life into the closest harmony with its environment that all the conditions of the case permit. Sometimes it will happen that the harmony will admit of being improved by an improvement of organization. But just as often it will happen that it will be best secured by leaving matters as they are. If, therefore, an organism has already been brought into a tolerably full degree of harmony with its environment, natural selection will not try to change it so long as the environment remains unchanged; this, no doubt, is the reason why some species have survived through enormous periods of geological time without having undergone any change. It is sometimes further urged, however, that there are cases where we cannot doubt that improvement of organization would have been a benefit to species, and yet such improvement has not taken place, as, for instance, in the case of all monkeys not turning into men. Here, however, we are reminded that the operation of natural selection in any case depends upon a variety of highly complex conditions, and therefore the fact of all those conditions having been satisfied in one instance is no reason for concluding that they must have also been satisfied in other instances. Take, for instance, the case of apes passing into men. To Mr. Romanes the wonder is that this improvement should have taken place in even one line of descent: not that having taken place in one line it should not also have taken place in other lines. For how enormously complex must have been the conditions physical, anatomical, physiological, psychological, sociological, which by their happy conjunction first began to raise the inarticulate cries of an ape into the rational speech of a man. There is yet another consideration to be taken into account. The struggle for existence is always the most keen between closely allied species, because from the similarity of their forms, habits, and needs they are in closest competition. Therefore it often happens that the mere fact of one species having made an advance upon others of itself precludes the others from making any similar advance. The field, so to speak, has already been occupied as regards that particular improvement, and where the struggle for existence is concerned possession is emphatically nine points of the law. For example, to return to the case of apes becoming men, the fact of one rational species having been already evolved (even if the rational faculty were at first but dimly nascent) must make an enormous change in the conditions as regards the possibility of any other such species being subsequently evolved. As Sir Charles Lyell has put it, two rational species can never co-exist on the globe.

Another and opposite objection to the theory of natural selection has sometimes been put forward, viz., that we ought never to find inferior forms of organization in company with superior, because in a struggle for existence the latter ought to have exterminated the former. According to the most recent expression of this view, "in every locality there would only be one species, and that the most highly organized; and thus a few superior races would partition the earth among them, to the entire seclusion of the innumerable varieties, species, genera, and orders which now inhabit it." To this statement Mr. Romanes deems it sufficient to reply by the counter inquiry, On what would these few supremely organized species subsist? In exterminating others on the exhaustive scale supposed, they would themselves be quickly and very literally improved off the face of the earth. Even when the statement is not made in so extravagant a form, it is pronounced futile as an objection, unless it has first been shown that we know exactly all the conditions of the complex struggle for existence between the higher and lower forms in question. This it is impossible for us to know. The mere fact that one form has been changed in virtue of this struggle, must in many cases of itself determine a change in the conditions of the struggle. Again, the other and closely allied forms (which furnish the best grounds for the objection) may also have undergone defensive changes, although these may be less conspicuous to our observation, or perhaps less suggestive of "improvement" to our imperfect means of judging. Lastly, there is the broad fact that the objection applies only to those cases where for some reason or another the lower forms have not been exposed to a struggle of fatal intensity. But we know that in millions of other cases the lower (*i. e.*, less fitted) forms have succumbed. That there is, indeed, a general tendency for lower forms to yield their places to higher, is shown by the gradual advance of organization throughout geological time; for if all the inferior forms had survived, the earth could not have contained them unless she had been continually growing into something like the size of Jupiter.

II.

Hitherto Mr. Romanes has been considering criticisms which have arisen from misapprehensions of Darwin's theory. He goes on to examine an objection admitted to be logically sound, which, nevertheless, is futile, because it is not supported by fact. This objection, which is made by Mr. St. George Mivart, is that similar organs, or structures, are to be met with in widely different branches of the tree of life. It is conceded by Mr. Romanes that this would be an objection fatal to the theory of natural selection, supposing these organs, or structures, in the cases compared, to be not merely analogous, but also homologous. It would be, he admits, incredible that in two totally different lines of descent one and the same structure should have been built up independently by two parallel series of variations, and that in these two lines of descent it should always, and independently, have ministered to the same function. On the other hand, there would be nothing against the theory of natural selection in the fact that two structures *not* homologous, should come by independent variation in two different lines of descent, to be adapted to perform the same function. For it belongs to the very essence of the theory of natural selection that a useful function should be secured by favorable variations of whatever structural material may happen to be presented by different organic types. Flying, for instance, is a very useful function, and it has been developed independently in at least four different lines of descent—namely, the insects, reptiles, birds, and mammals. Now, if in all, or indeed in any, of these four cases the wings had been developed on the same anatomical pattern, so as not only to present the analogical resemblance which they must present in order to discharge their common function of flying, but likewise an homologous or structural resemblance showing that they had been formed on the same anatomical plan: if such a case could be produced, it is acknowledged by Mr. Romanes that the theory of natural selection would be upset. Now, Mr. Mivart has alleged that there are several such cases in organic nature. He has instanced the eye of the cuttlefish as not only analogous, but also homologous, with the eye of a true fish—that is to say, the eye of a mollusk with the eye of a vertebrate—and he has also instanced the remarkable resemblance of a shrew to a mouse, or, in other words, of an insectivorous mammal to a rodent. Both of these examples are examined in this volume and pronounced cases not of homologous, but of analogous, similarity. That is to say, the points of likeness have not been produced on the same anatomical plan.

Even the author of this book encounters a great difficulty in explaining, by the theory of natural selection, the preservation of the first beginnings of structures which are then useless, though afterward, when more fully developed, they become useful. How, for instance, are we to account on the Darwinian hypothesis for the existence of the electric organ in the tail of the skate? Where electric organs occur in the gymnotus and torpedo they are obviously useful for both offensive and defensive purposes, because they produce more or less powerful shocks. On the other hand, the discharge from the electric organ in the tail of a skate is apparently useless, for it is too weak to be felt by the hand, and its existence can only be demonstrated by the telephone. Yet for the delivery of such an impotent discharge, imperceptible alike to prey and to enemies, there is provided an organ of such extreme peculiarity and complexity that, regarded as a piece of living mechanism, it ranks at once as the most specialized and elaborated structure in the whole animal kingdom. Mr. Romanes does not pretend to suggest how this astonishing structure—to his mind more amazing even than the human eye—can ever have been begun or afterward developed by means of natural selection. He considers the difficulty presented by this case of a magnitude and importance altogether unequalled by that of any other obstruction which has hitherto been encountered by the theory of natural selection. If there were many other cases of the like kind to be met with in nature, he would himself at once allow that the theory of natural selection would have to be discarded. But inasmuch as this particular case stands so far entirely by itself, and therefore out of analogy with thousands or even millions of other cases throughout the whole range of organic nature, he is constrained to feel it more probable that the electric organ of the skate will some day admit of being marshalled under the general law of natural selection, in just the same way as proved to be the case with the coloring of certain caterpillars, which at one time seemed to constitute a serious obstacle to the acceptance of the hypothesis, and yet, through a better knowledge of all the relations involved, has become one of the strongest witnesses in its favor.

There are three other objections to the theory of natural selection which form a logically connected array. These three are: first, that a large proportional number of specific as well as of higher taxonomic characters are seemingly useless, and therefore do not lend themselves to explanation by the Darwinian theory; secondly, that the most general of all specific characters, viz., cross-infertility between allied species, cannot possibly be due to natural selection, as is demonstrated by Darwin himself; thirdly, that the swamping effects of free intercrossing must always render impossible by natural selection alone any evolution of species in divergent (as distinguished from serial) lines of change. Mr. Romanes himself has not the smallest doubt that these three objections are not only valid in themselves, but constitute by far the most formidable obstructions which the theory of natural selection has met with. From another point of view, however, he is equally convinced that they all admit of absolute annihilation. The antithesis arises from difference of standpoint, or, rather, from differences in the view which we take of the theory of natural selection itself. If we understand this theory to set forth natural selection as the *sole* cause of organic evolution, then the three objections to the theory just cited are not merely valid and formidable, but logically insurmountable. On the other hand, if we take Darwin's theory to consist merely in setting forth natural selection as a factor of organic evolution, even although we believe it to have been the chief factor, or principal cause, all the three objections in question necessarily vanish. For in this case, even if it be satisfactorily proved that the theory of natural selection is unable to explain the three classes of facts above mentioned, the theory is not thereby affected. Facts of each and all of these classes may be consistently left by the theory to be accounted for by causes other than natural selection—whether these up to the present time be capable or incapable of hypothetical formulation. Thus, in the author's opinion, whether the three objections named are to be regarded as logically insurmountable by Darwin's theory, or as logically non-existent in respect to it, depends simply upon the manner in which the theory itself is stated.

In his second volume, to be published in the autumn, Mr. Romanes will have a great deal more to say upon these matters, especially with regard to the causes other than natural selection which in his opinion are capable of explaining the difficulties just pointed out. In the present book all that he attempts to show is that whatever may be thought touching the supplementary theories whereby he will endeavor to explain the facts of infertility, cross-sterility, and non-occurrence of free intercrossing, no one of these facts is entitled to rank as an objection against the theory of natural selection, unless we understand his theory to claim an exclusive prerogative in the field of organic evolution. This, to be sure, is what Mr. Wallace does claim for it; while on the other hand Darwin expressly and even vehemently repudiated the claim. It follows that all the three main objections against the theory of natural selection are objections which vitally affect the theory only as it has been stated and upheld by Wallace. As the theory has been stated and upheld by Darwin all these objections are irrelevant.

The conclusion reached after a review of all the principal criticisms of the doctrine of natural selection is that neither singly nor collectively are they entitled to much weight. On the other hand, there is a vast accumulation of evidence in favor of the theory. Hence it is no wonder that this has now been accepted by all naturalists, with scarcely any one notable exception, as at any rate the best working hypothesis which has ever been propounded whereby to explain the facts of organic evolution. Whether we should go further and side with those who accept the Darwinian theory as virtually a completed deduction, or the proved exhibition of a general law whereby the causation of organic evolution admits of being in large part explained, depends, as Mr. Romanes concedes, upon what we mean by an explanation of the case before us. If we only mean that, given a large class of known facts and unknown causes, which are summarized under the terms heredity and variability, then the further facts of struggle and survival serve in some considerable degree to account for the phenomena of adaptive evolution, Mr. Romanes can see no room to question that the evidence is sufficient to prove the statement. It is clear, however, that by taking for granted the great facts of heredity and variability, we assume the larger part of the problem as a whole, or rather by comprehending in a mere verbal expression all the unknown causes concerned in these two great factors of the process of adaptation, we do not so much as attempt to explain the precedent causation which serves as a condition to the process of natural selection. Much more than half the battle would have been won had Darwin's predecessors been able to explain the causes of heredity and variation; hence, it is but a very partial victory which has been gained by the Darwinian discoverers of the effects of struggle and survival. It is to a solution of the problems of heredity and variation that Dr. Weismann has devoted himself. We shall look forward with interest to what Mr. Romanes has to say concerning the success of the German professor's attempts in that direction.

IS SPRING POETRY DECLINING?

The Cream of the Output During the Season Just Ended.

From the Chicago Mail.

The season still is backward,
And yet with pain we note
The advent of the imbecile
Who yearns to rock the boat.

From the St. Paul Pioneer Press.

Though springtime poets rave and sing,
This has escaped them all:
In the spring the blossoms spring
And in the fall they fall.

From the Kansas City Daily Journal.

In the spring a deeper crimson comes upon the robin's breast;
In the spring the wanton lapwing gets himself another nest;
In the spring six days are cloudy for each one that's bright and fair;
In the spring we know not when to peel our flannel underwear.

From Brooklyn Life.

What does little birdie sing
On the cherry bough in spring?
Listen to his merry note
As it gurgles in his throat:
"Tra la le li lo la lum,
Little birdie wants a wum!"

From the Kansas City Daily Journal.

A bluebird sat on a lilac tree,
Singing his song of spring;
And he brought to the farmer's boy happy thoughts
Of the joys the summer would bring.
But, alas! the blizzard swept down from the north
With mercury at zero breath,
And in wind and rain, the boy and the bird
Danced an aguish jig with death.

From Brooklyn Life.

The trees are budding thick and fast,
Bright flowers are sprinkled o'er the lawn;
Youth fears no more the wintry blast
And puts his overcoat in pawn.

'Tis now the earth shakes off its cares
And all its laughter, mirth, and fun;
The poet now his poem prepares,
The editor prepares his gun.

And blithely sings the gladsome lark
O'er woodlawn deep and meadow damp,
While on the benches in the park
Reposeful rests the gentle tramp.

Soft the mild breeze our face doth fan,
Bringing a joy to old and young;
While the light coat and moving van
Proclaim to us that spring has sprung.

THE SONG OF THE MERMAN.

Another Version of the Sea Ballad in Capt. Robinson's Story.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* I was glad to notice in your story "'Ar-r Blows," in THE SUN last Sunday, the words of an old sea song, which, it was claimed, had not been in print before. I can't dispute that point, but I rather think my version of it, as I heard it on a big wool ship coming around the Horn from Sydney to London in '77, is an improvement on the way you printed it, and is, perhaps, the original version. If your Captain-author had disremembered his own version, this may refresh his memory. S.

On the 17th of January,
Down in the southern seas,
Where we let go our anchor
A-waiting for a breeze,
The Cap-i-tan was down below
And the men all lay about,
When underneath our bows there came
A splash and a reg'lar shout.
Chorus—Singing, blow, ye winds, Ay O!
Blow, ye winds, Ay-O!
Clear away the morning dew,
And blow, ye winds, Ay-O!

"Man overboard!" the lookout he cries,
When for'ard the whole of us ran,
And there, sitting onto our best bower chain
Was a jolly old fat merman.
His nose was red and his eyes were green,
And a mouth as big as three;
And the great big tail that he sat upon
Was hanging 'way down in the sea.—[Chorus.]

Up steps our mate as bold as brass,
"What cheer, messmate!" says he,
"O, I want for to see your Cap-i-tan,
A favor for to ask of he."
Our Cap-i-tan then came on deck,
And he gazed on the waters blue.
"Come, tell me, my man, as quick as you can,
What favor I can do for you."—[Chorus.]

"O, you've dropped your anchor in front of my house,
And you've stopped up its only door,
And my wife can't get out for to roam about
With her kids, one, two, three, four.
It would break your heart to hear her growl
And the rows she's had with me
I've been out all night and got jolly well tight
At the bottom of the deep blue sea."—[Chorus.]

Our Cap-i-tan said: "The anchor shall be weighed,
And your wife and kids set free,
But I never saw before from a sprat to a whale
A fish that could talk to me,
Your figurehead is like a sailor bold
And you talk like an Irishman,
But where did you get such a wonderful tail?
Come, tell me that, if you can."—[Chorus.]

"O, a long time ago, in the ship Hero,
I was washed overboard in a gale,
And away down below where the seaweeds grow
I met a lovely girl with a tail.
She saved my life and I made her my wife
And my feet changed instant-lee,
And now I'm married to a jolly mermaid
At the bottom of the deep blue sea."—[Chorus.]

QUESTIONS BY SUN READERS.

Did the *Herald*, *Sun*, *Times*, *Tribune*, and *World* publish Sunday editions in March, 1877? Did the *Tribune* print such an edition in 1872? MASS.

The *Herald*, *Sun*, *Times*, and *World* printed Sunday editions in March, 1877; the *Tribune* did not. The *Herald* first printed a Sunday edition on Dec. 12, 1841; the *Times* followed on April 21, 1861; the *World* began on April 5, 1868; THE SUN came next in 1875, Dec. 5, and the *Tribune* came along on Dec. 7, 1879.

If Sharkey, the escaped murderer, should be recaptured and returned to New York would he be hanged or killed by electricity? H. L. H.

He would be liable to be hanged; the present law applies only to crimes punishable by death committed on and after Jan. 1, 1889. We doubt if he would be hanged, however.

In case of war can the President order out the militia of a State without the consent of the Governor of the State? M. J.

Yes, to repel invasion. But the trouble is that practically there is no militia as contemplated by the United States laws, and the National Guards can't be ordered out by the President because they're not national in anything but name.

1. Is it true that a man may have more than one legal wife in the State of New York? 2. Is it true that a man who marries in England but abandons his wife and marries again here can be prosecuted for bigamy? R. W. P.

1. The way of it is this. A man's wife deserts him, and he hears nothing of or from her for five years; the laws holds that such cessation of intercourse and information is *prima facie* evidence that she is dead. Then the man marries again; and the first wife turns up. So the man has two legal wives. 2. If the deserted wife comes to this country, he may be prosecuted for bigamy, because the crime, though begun in England, is repeated here.

1. When was Hellgate blown up? 2. When was the last earthquake of any consequence in this vicinity? C. R.

1. On Sept. 24, 1876, and on Oct. 10, 1885. 2. Oct. 20, 1870. There have been slight shocks since then, in June, 1886, and March, 1887, but they did little damage. Even the earthquake of 1870 amounted to little, and seems to have caused more alarm than actual loss. THE SUN treated it humorously, and described how the Hon. X. X. Andrews suffered the most damage, having only one to go in billiards when the shock came. He lost his point, carromed on his opponent's nose, and had to pay for the game and a large bottle.

Some time ago you published an article with reference to a claim by the Edwards heirs to certain property in New York and elsewhere. Will you inform me whether any suit has been instituted in this matter, and, if so, who are the attorneys for the plaintiffs? HENRY J. MEYERS.

No suit has been begun, no suit will be begun; there is no Edwards estate; there are no Edwards heirs. The claim is a myth; the claimants are swindled, the attorneys are swindlers. The same gang has now started a search for the heirs of one Jacob Baker of Philadelphia, who leased a plot of land in the centre of that city for ninety-nine years; the lease is now just expired. That's the Edwards estate with a different name and in a different place; and a third gang is working the same scheme in England, locating the estate in Cincinnati or Cleveland.

Does the Constitution of the United States, under Article II., section 2, prohibit a President and Vice-President from being chosen from the same State? I understand that the electors of any State could not vote for two candidates of their own State, but does that prohibit them from voting for two men of one State other than their own? P. S. W.

By Article XII. of the amendments, the President and Vice-President must be taken from different States. Take your suggestion; it would work in forty-three cases, but the electors of the forty-fourth State would have to vote for two candidates from their own State, which would violate the Constitution.

Will you state your estimate of the amount of money given by the wealthy class in this country chiefly for the benefit of the non-wealthy class, say in the last hundred years. Of course it can be but a very general estimate. It would have some bearing on the question as to the real disposition of the rich toward the poor. CONSTANT READER.

It is a very large class, "the wealthy class," and the "non-wealthy class" is larger. Do the Police Pension Fund and the Press Club Benefit Fund beneficiaries belong to the non-wealthy class? Do the readers at the Astor Library, the students at the colleges, belong there? Counting in gifts to colleges, hospitals, missions of various sorts (not to churches), probably from 1801 to the present the wealthy class of the country has given for the benefit of the non-wealthy class at least $100,000,000, or not far from $1,000,000 a year on an average.

Which has the right of way, a mail wagon or a fire engine going to a fire? M. K.

The mail wagon. Why, that has precedence even over the police parade; and what more can it have than that?

Which of the following sentences is grammatically correct, "I think this fleet of Cleopatra will not come," or, "I think this fleet of Cleopatra's will not come." Please give rule governing same. W. C.

The first sentence. "Of" is the sign of the possessive case, and thus there is no need of repeating the sign, as in the second sentence, by using the apostrophe and the letter "s."

When was the old North Dutch Church, afterward used as the New York Post Office, and located corner Nassau and Liberty streets, built? M. F. G.

In 1729. It was first used as a Post Office in 1845, and was torn down to make way for the Mutual Life Insurance Company's building in 1882.

I am told that St. Bartholomew's Hospital, London, stands on the spot where people were put to death by Catholics. I am a Catholic and I feel it an insult. M. C. CRONIN.

Your friend is wrong. The present buildings of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, in West Smithfield, London, were begun in 1547, but executions by the orders of Queen Mary of England took place in front of the hospital, where the martyrs' memorial now stands. These are probably what your friend means.

In case of war with any other nation, can fighting begin at once? If not at once, how soon? E. F. P.

So far as this country is concerned, we can declare war only by a bill passed by both Houses of Congress and approved by the President. That would take some time; but as soon as the bill was a law we could begin hostilities. Of course, all other countries do not require such parliamentary preliminaries to a declaration of war; so that a country could declare war by actually beginning hostilities.

What is the meaning of the term "modus vivendi" used in connection with the Behring Sea matter? C. E.

The expression is Latin; it means simply "mode of living," or way of rubbing on together. A similar expression is "modus operandi," "mode of working."

Of what nationality is a person born in this city of foreign parents? What is the nationality of the son of German parents born on an English vessel on the high seas? E. McU.

He may follow the nationality of his parents, or may call himself, and be, an American. So with the second child; it may be a German, or an Englishman.

James Henderson.—To find the record of a Connecticut Revolutionary soldier write to the Adjutant-General of the State. We think that Connecticut has published a book, giving the records of its Revolutionary soldiers.

S. A. B.—1. There are more Roman Catholics in the United States than there are members of any other sect. 2. There are supposed to be more followers of Buddha in the world than members of any other Church.

L. H.—The New York Trade Schools are at Sixty-sixth street and First avenue; lessons are given both afternoon and evening. Other manual training schools are; Institution for the Improved Instruction of Deaf Mutes, 904-922 Lexington avenue; the Hebrew Technical Institute, 34 Stuyvesant street, and an institution at 9 University place.

S. G. Arton, Jr.—As the biographies in the Congressional Directory are "inspired," and therefore must be taken as official, the name of the Hon. Mr. Simpson of Kansas must be Jerry, and not Jeremiah.

Ventilation.—It is always proper to resort to window ventilation if no other means of ventilation is attainable. Lower the windows from the top; if possible open one window from the bottom, but choose a window the opening of which will not create a draught across any pupil. Heated air rises, and will escape through the lowered windows, while the fresh air will enter through the raised windows.

K. Dunk.—It is correct grammatically to say, as is said on the silver certificates, "There have been deposited two silver dollars," &c., but rhetorically the expression is incorrect.

J. R. T.—The Chairman of the House Committee on War Claims is Frank E. Beltzhoover; of the Senate Committee on Claims is Watson C. Squire.

J. Clague.—The Earl of Aberdeen, Prime Minister of Great Britain from December, 1852, to February, 1855, was a Tory.

Fenwick.—Your etymology of Bannockburn was suggested by Mr. E. W. Claggett early last January. Isaac Taylor, in his "Words and Places," which is an accepted authority, finds the origin of Bannock in the Gaelic and Erse *ban* or *bann*, meaning "white," so that Bannockburn is the "stream of the white water."

A. Gates.—1. There is no supervisor in New York city, except the Federal Supervisor of Elections, whose business it is to prevent as many Democrats from voting as he can, under the pretence of preserving the purity of the ballot box. 2. Senator Vedder was in the Assembly from 1872 to 1875 inclusive, and in the Senate in 1876, 1877, and [illegible] inclusive, and 1891.

F. W. R.—You might get a caveat on your invention; it will last for one year and cost $10. As to the "unscrupulous patent lawyers," there may be some, but most patent lawyers wouldn't care a rap for your invention, and don't care a rap for the inventions for which they procure patents. Patent lawyers, as a rule, are not shysters; so you needn't be afraid of your precious invention being stolen. You are too suspicious for every-day use. You'd better not talk of the invention or even think about it, for fear some mind-reader will learn all about it.